

THE REMARKS

Claims 1-51 were pending prior to entering the amendments.

The Amendments

The Specification has been amended to add the application serial numbers. Independent claims 1, 10, 27 and 39 have been amended. Dependent claims 15, 29, 43, and 46-47 have also been amended. Support for these amendments is found in the Applicant's Specification as follows:

Claims 1, Page 7, ln 12-16

Claim 10 -- Page 6, ln 14-17

Claims 27, 39 --Page 6, line 12-17

Claims 15, 29, 43, 46-47 -- Correct formalities.

No new matter is introduced in any of the above amendments. The Examiner is requested to enter the amendment and re-consider the application.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

Claims 1-9 and 39-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The elements noted by the Examiner in the office action have been deleted in claims 1 and 39. The Applicant respectfully assert that claims 1 and 39 are allowable with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph. The associated dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim, with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection

Claims 10, 17-19, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 allegedly because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the limitation that "the client communicates to the authenticator from a user station." The user station is inherently physical. The Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 10 allowable with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 101. The associated dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 101.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 39, 40-42, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart (U.S. Patent 6,732,176) in view of Choi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0224690).

In response, the Applicant has amended the claim to recite as follows:

A method of controlling access to a network, comprising:

requesting an identity from a mobile client attempting to connect to the network;

receiving the identity;

associating location information corresponding to the client with the identity;

authenticating the identity;

comparing the location information against a policy designating locations, if any, at which the client is permitted to connect to the network; and

deciding whether to grant or deny client access to the network based on the authenticity of the identity and comparison of the location information,

wherein the location information indicates the location of a network switch to which the client is attempting to connect, and the location information indicates the association between a particular port of the network switch and the physical location of an edge device or a wired user station associated with the particular port of the network switch.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that this claim is allowable for the following reason:

Neither Stewart nor Choi disclose that the location information indicates the association between a particular port of the network switch and the physical location of an edge device or a

wired user station associated with the particular port of the network switch. These references do not disclose these location features, considered singly or in combination. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claims 1 are non-obvious over Stewart, in view of Choi. The associated dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

The Applicant also offers the following remark relative to Liming (US 200210055924 A1) which was cited for claims 8, 44, and 48. Whereas Liming does disclose features to locate the position of network elements, Liming does not disclose the determination of a port in reference paragraph [0159].

Relative to claim 39, claim 39 has been amended and recites as follows:

A network system for controlling access to a network, comprising:

means for requesting an identity from a mobile client attempting to connect to the network;

means for receiving the identity;

first associating means for associating location information corresponding to the client with the identity;

authenticating means for authenticating the identity;

means for comparing the location information against a policy designating locations, if any, at which the client is permitted to connect to the network;

means for deciding whether to grant or deny the client access to the network based on the authenticity of the identity and the comparison of the location information, and

a means for network management comprising a means for a server that runs an application that permits a network administrator the means to configure the location information and software images stored in means for switching; and

a network means that connects the means for network management, the means for authentication and the means for switching,

wherein the network system further comprises a means for network management, wherein the means for network management configures the means for authenticating,

wherein the means for network management either (1) connects to the network or (2) directly connects to the means for switching and directly connects to the means for authentication,

whereby when the means for network management directly connects to the means for switching and the means for authentication, the means for network is bypassed.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that this claim is allowable for the following reason:

Neither Stewart nor Choi disclose a network management system that can optionally connect to the network or directly connect to the means for authentication and means for switching. A review of both reference confirm that these network management features are not disclosed, considered singly or in combination.

Therefore the Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is non-obvious over Stewart, in view of Choi. The associated dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 3, 7, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Choi, further in view of Funk (Funk Software, "Comprehensive RADIUS/AAA Solution for the Global Enterprise", 2/22/2003, pp. 1-6).

Claims 3, 7, and 43 are dependent on claims 1 and 39. Therefore, these claims are allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 8, 44, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Choi, further in view of Liming (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0055924).

Claims 8, 44, and 48 are dependent on claims 1 and 39. Therefore, these claims are allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0149443).

Claim 10 has been amended to add the element, “a network manager comprising an application running on a server, wherein the application permits the network administrator to create and update a policy table in the authentication server”. In this regard:

Stewart and Torvinen are silent on the subject of network administrator, and

Stewart and Torvinen are silent on the subject of a policy table.

Therefore, the cited references do not disclose these features of a network manager. The Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 10 is non-obvious over Stewart, in view of Torvinen. The associated dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 11, 20, 27-29, and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of Kwan (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0255154).

Claim 27 has been amended to recite,

A network system, comprising:

a plurality of edge devices capable of communicating with a plurality of user stations over one or more wireless channels;

one or more network switches;

a first application running on the one or more network switches, for requesting station identities from the user stations and for associating corresponding location information with each of the station identities;

an authentication server for deciding whether to grant or deny each of user stations access to the network based upon the corresponding identity and location information; and;

a network manager comprising a server that runs an application that permits a network administrator to configure the location information and

software images stored in the one or more switches; and

a network that connects the network manager, the authentication server and the one or more switches,

wherein the network manager either (1) connects to the network or (2) directly connects to the one or more switches and directly connects to the authentication server,

whereby when the network manager directly connects to the one or more switches and the authentication server, the network is bypassed.

Claim 27 recites similar elements as described in claim 39. That is:

Neither Stewart nor Choi disclose a network management system that can optionally connect to the network or directly connect to the authentication server and one or more switches.

A review of both reference confirm that these network management features are not disclosed, considered singly or in combination.

Therefore the Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 27 is non-obvious over Stewart, in view of Choi. The associated dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim. Similarly, claims 11 and 20 are allowable since the base claim 1 is allowable as noted above.

Claims 17 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of Liming.

These dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claims 23, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of Funk.

These dependent claims are therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen and Kwan, further in view of Liming.

This dependent claim is therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen and Kwan, further in view of Funk.

This dependent claim is therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen, further in view of Tan (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0045451).

This dependent claim is therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stewart in view of Torvinen and Kwan, further in view of Tan.

This dependent claim is therefore allowable at least based upon an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the application is now in good and proper condition for allowance. Early notification of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 3, 2010

/Donald R. Gibson/
Donald R. Gibson (Reg. No. 59,564)

HOWREY LLP
2941 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 200
Falls Church, VA 22042
Tel: (650) 798-3570
Fax: (650) 798-3600